IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EUGENE EDWARDS,)	
)	
Petitioner)	Civil Action
)	No. 16-cv-03554
V.)	
)	
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF BUCKS)	
COUNTY and)	
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE)	
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,)	
)	
Respondents)	

ORDER

NOW, this 26th day of February, 2017, upon consideration of following documents:

Petition Under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody filed by petitioner Eugene Edwards pro se on May 30, 2016;¹

Answer in Opposition to Petition for Habeas Corpus Relief and Memorandum of Law in Support Thereof, which answer was filed by respondents on October 24, 2016, together with

Supplement to Answer in Opposition to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus/Memorandum of Law in Support Thereof Pursuant to U.S.C.S. Section 2254, Rule 5;

Exhibits A through C;

Petitioner Eugene Edwards certifies that he placed his petition in the prison mailing system on May 30, 2016. Petition Under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody at page 16.

Pursuant to the prison mailbox rule, this court will consider its date of filing to be May 30, 2016. The prison mailbox rule deems a pro se prisoner's habeas corpus petition to have been filed on the date he delivers it to prison officials to mail. <u>Burns v. Morton</u>, 134 F.3d 109, 113 (3d Cir. 1997).

Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Timothy R. Rice dated and filed December 19, 2016;

it appearing that no objections have been filed to the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Rice; 2 it further appearing after review of this matter that Magistrate Judge Rice's Report and Recommendation correctly determined the legal and factual issues presented in the petition for habeas corpus relief,

IT IS ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Rice's Report and Recommendation is approved and adopted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's Petition Under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody is denied without an evidentiary hearing.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that because petitioner has not met statutory requirements to have his case heard, and no

Petitioner received a Notice accompanying the Report and Recommendation stating that petitioner was required to file any objections to the Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of service of the Notice and filing of the Report and Recommendation pursuant to Rule 72.1(IV)(b) of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The Report and Recommendation and the Notice were filed and served by mail and email on December 19, 2016. Thus, any objections were required to be filed on or before January 2, 2017.

On January 3, 2017, the court received a letter from petitioner dated December 29, 2016, which requested a 14-day extension to file objections to Magistrate Judge Rice's Report and Recommendation. By Order dated and filed January 24, 2017, I granted petitioner's letter request and ordered him to file his objections by February 9, 2017. In effect, petitioner had an additional 38 days to file objections.

However, as of the date of this Order, petitioner has not filed any objections to the Report and Recommendation.

reasonable jurist could find this procedural ruling debatable, a certificate of appealability is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall mark this matter closed for statistical purposes.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ JAMES KNOLL GARDNER

James Knoll Gardner United States District Judge